



PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number	09/875,707
Filing Date	June 5, 2001
First Named Inventor	Dan Kikinis
Art Unit	2617
Examiner Name	Laye, Jade O.

Attorney Docket Number ISURFTV137

AF
JFW

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- Fee Transmittal Form
- Fee Attached
- Amendment/Reply
 - After Final
 - Affidavits/declaration(s)
- Extension of Time Request
- Express Abandonment Request
- Information Disclosure Statement
- Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
 - Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

- Drawing(s)
- Licensing-related Papers
- Petition
- Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- Power of Attorney, Revocation
- Change of Correspondence Address
- Terminal Disclaimer
- Request for Refund
- CD, Number of CD(s) _____
- Landscape Table on CD

Remarks

This is a corrected appeal brief in response to Notification of Non Compliant Appeal Brief. The fee for the brief was paid with the original brief.

 After Allowance Communication to TC Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Proprietary Information Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):

Postcard

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name Holland & Knight LLP

Signature

Printed name Michael J. Buchenhorner

Date July 3, 2006 Reg. No. 33,162

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name Michael J. Buchenhorner Date July 3, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Attorney's Docket No.: ISURFTV137

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Dan Kikinis

Art Unit : 2617

Examiner : Laye, Jade O.

Serial No.: 09/875,707

Filed : June 5, 2001

Method and Apparatus for Notifying Users of Interactive Functions

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CORRECTED APPEAL BRIEF

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify under 37 CFR §1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated below and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

July 3, 2006
Date of Deposit

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Signature

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate

09875707
00000051
502870

07/11/2006 MABILR1 00000051 502870
01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(1)	Real Party in Interest	3
(2)	Related Appeals and Interferences	4
(3)	Status of Claims	5
(4)	Status of Amendments	6
(5)	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	7
(6)	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	9
(a)	Obviousness.	10
1.	Rejection of claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been unpatentable over Ellis et al (U.S. Patent Application 2005/0028208, hereafter "Ellis") and Sorensen (U.S. Patent 6,628,729).	10
2.	Rejection of claims 6, 14, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been unpatentable over Ellis and Sorensen further in view of Elliot (US Patent No. 6,473,097.	13
Appendix of Claims.....		15
Evidence Appendix.....		19
Related Proceedings Appendix.....		20

Applicant : Kikinis
Serial No. : 09/875,707
Filed : June 5, 2001
Page : 3 of 20

Attorney's Docket No.: ISURFTV137

(1) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is iSurfTV, Inc., a California corporation which is the assignee.

Applicant : Kikinis
Serial No. : 09/875,707
Filed : June 5, 2001
Page : 4 of 20

Attorney's Docket No.: ISURFTV137

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

None.

Applicant : Kikinis
Serial No. : 09/875,707
Filed : June 5, 2001
Page : 5 of 20

Attorney's Docket No.: ISURFTV137

(3) Status of Claims

Claims 1-24 are pending in this case. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al (U.S. Patent Application 2005/0028208, hereafter "Ellis") and Sorensen (U.S. Patent 6,628,729, hereafter "Sorensen"). Claims 6, 14, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been unpatentable over Ellis in view of Sorensen and further in view of Elliot (U.S. Patent 6,473,097, hereafter "Elliot"). All of the pending claims are being appealed.

Applicant : Kikinis
Serial No. : 09/875,707
Filed : June 5, 2001
Page : 6 of 20

Attorney's Docket No.: ISURFTV137

(4) Status of Amendments

No substantive amendments have been made since the final office action dated November 16, 2005.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a method comprising transmitting information and receiving information via a wireless connection simultaneously to and from a plurality of hand-held devices. The information interacts with an electronic programming guide (EPG) [specification, page 11, paragraph 39]; indicating an availability of an interactive function in a program corresponding to the EPG simultaneously at said plurality of hand-held devices [specification, page 12, paragraph 43].

Claim 9

Claim 9 relates to a method comprising: transmitting information and receiving information via a wireless connection simultaneously to and from a plurality of hand-held devices, the information interacting with an electronic programming guide (EPG) [page 11, paragraph 39]; and indicating an availability of an interactive function in a program corresponding to the EPG simultaneously at said plurality of hand-held devices [page 12, paragraph 43].

Claim 16

Claim 16 relates to a machine readable medium having stored thereon a set of instructions, which when executed cause a system to perform a method comprising: transmitting information and receiving information via a wireless connection simultaneously to and from a plurality of hand-held devices, the information interacting with an electronic programming guide (EPG) [page 11, paragraph 39]; and indicating

Applicant : Kikinis
Serial No. : 09/875,707
Filed : June 5, 2001
Page : 8 of 20

Attorney's Docket No.: ISURFTV137

an availability of an interactive function in a program corresponding to the EPG simultaneously at said plurality of hand-held devices [page 12, paragraph 43].

Applicant : Kikinis
Serial No. : 09/875,707
Filed : June 5, 2001
Page : 9 of 20

Attorney's Docket No.: ISURFTV137

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal are:

1. Did the examiner properly reject claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been unpatentable over Ellis et al (U.S. Patent Application 2005/0028208, hereafter "Ellis") and Sorensen (U.S. Patent 6,628,729)?
2. Did the examiner properly reject claims 6, 14, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been unpatentable over Ellis and Sorensen further in view of Elliot (US Patent No. 6,473,097)?

(7) Argument

(a) Obviousness.

1. Rejection of claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23 and 24 under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) as having been unpatentable over Ellis et al (U.S. Patent Application 2005/0028208, hereafter "Ellis") and Sorensen (U.S. Patent 6,628,729).

The Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been unpatentable over Ellis and Sorensen. Claim 1 requires a unit to transmit information and to receive information via a wireless connection; a plurality of hand-held devices capable of simultaneously communicating with said unit, wherein each apparatus comprises a control unit to interact with an electronic programming guide (EPG) and an indicator to indicate an availability of an interactive function in a program corresponding to the EPG.

Ellis relates to a system that allows a user to adjust the user settings of a plurality of program guides. See Ellis at Paragraphs 12 and 13. Thus, a user may adjust his favorite settings in the family room and may direct the system to apply these settings to the family room and the living room. See Ellis at paragraph 26. Therefore, Sorensen neither teaches nor suggests "a plurality of hand-held devices capable of simultaneously communicating with said unit." Rather Sorensen teaches communicating with a plurality of entertainment units.

The Examiner admits that "Ellis fails to disclose the remaining limitations of claim 1." See Final Office Action at page 3. However, the Examiner contends that Sorensen teaches "indicating the availability of interactive data..." See Final Office Action at page 3. A close look at Sorensen shows that Sorensen contains no such teaching. Sorensen does not teach or suggest "indicating an availability of an interactive function." Sorensen is directed to a portable data storage device which receives and stores data from a receiver. Col. 1, lines 7-10. Sorensen discloses that a digital receiver such as a digital TV receives a digital broadcast signal and separates the data from the signal. Col. 1, lines 50-67. Thereafter, a portable storage device such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) receives the data from the digital receiver and stores the same in its memory. Col. 1, lines 61-67. The data may comprise TV commercial, internet data such as a uniform resource locator (URL), or data for generating a coupon. Col. 1, 30-40; Col. 2, lines 61-66. Sorensen provides that after the PDA stores the data, a tone, a beep, a light emitting diode flash, or other form of alert may be generated to alert the user that the data has been stored. Col. 3, lines 22-36. Sorensen further discloses that when internet content is detected by a TV controller, it may provide a prompt to the user via a signal transmitted to the PDA in order to initiate local prompt by the PDA. Col. 3, lines 47-54. However, this is different from the presently claimed invention which is capable of simultaneously communicating with a plurality of hand-held devices. Furthermore, Sorensen merely teaches prompting a user when data such as a TV commercial, internet data, specifically a URL, or data for generating a coupon is provided. On the other hand, Applicant's presently claimed invention provides an

indication of an availability of an interactive function in a program corresponding to the EPG. Sorensen neither teaches nor suggests the presently claimed invention.

Moreover, the Examiner's conclusion to combine the Elliot and Sorensen references is also an error of law. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Elliot and Sorensen "in order to provide a device capable of alerting a user to the presence of interactive broadcast data corresponding to an EPG, thereby providing a remote with extended functionality." "Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability--the essence of hindsight." *Id. Ecolochem v. Southern California Edison*, 228 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

A piecemeal reconstruction of the prior art patents in light of the applicant's disclosure shall not be the basis for a holding of obviousness. *In re Kamm*, 172 USPQ 298 (CCPA 1972). Thus, it is impermissible within the framework of section 103 to pick and choose from any one reference only so much as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. *Kamm*, 172 USPQ at 302. In the instant case, the Examiner did not cite any evidence of the reason to combine. Therefore, no *prima facie* case of infringement has been made.

Claims 2-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23 and 24 are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

2. Rejection of claims 6, 14, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been unpatentable over Ellis and Sorensen further in view of Elliot (US Patent No. 6,473,097).

The examiner erred in rejecting claims 6, 14, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been unpatentable over Ellis and Sorensen further in view of Elliot.

Claims 6, 14 and 22 all recite a web phone as the remote control in the entertainment system.

As discussed above, Ellis and Sorensen do not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1. Elliott is directed to an IP intranet functionality in a Mobile Switching Center for supporting wireless data and multimedia services that is introduced between a multimedia device and the internet. Col. 4, lines 48-52. Elliott is an inapposite prior art because it is directed to a field of endeavor different from the presently claimed invention. Elliott neither teaches nor suggests using a web enabled phone to make EPG selections. It makes no suggestions relating to entertainment systems. The Examiner cites no evidence of a teaching, suggestion or motivation. Deficiencies of cited references cannot be remedied by the Board's [or Examiner's] general conclusions about what is "basic knowledge" or "common sense" to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2001). Therefore, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been made.

Applicant : Kikinis
Serial No. : 09/875,707
Filed : June 5, 2001
Page : 14 of 20

Attorney's Docket No.: ISURFTV137

The brief fee of \$500 is enclosed. Please apply any other charges or credits to
Deposit Account No. 50-2870.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 3, 2006

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

Appendix of Claims

1. An entertainment system comprising:
 - a unit to transmit information and to receive information via a wireless connection;
 - a plurality of hand-held devices capable of simultaneously communicating with said unit, wherein each apparatus comprises a control unit to interact with an electronic programming guide (EPG) and
 - an indicator to indicate an availability of an interactive function in a program corresponding to the EPG.
2. The entertainment system of claim 1, wherein the indicator is displayed on a display of the apparatus.
3. The entertainment system of claim 2, wherein the display changes background colors to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.
4. The entertainment system of claim 2, wherein the display flashes to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.
5. The entertainment system of claim 1, wherein the apparatus is a personal digital assistant.
6. The entertainment system of claim 1, wherein the apparatus is a web phone.
7. The entertainment system of claim 1, wherein the indicator is a unit that generates a sound to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.

8. The entertainment system of claim 1, wherein the indicator is a section of the apparatus that illuminates to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.

9. A method comprising:

transmitting information and receiving information via a wireless connection simultaneously to and from a plurality of hand-held devices, the information interacting with an electronic programming guide (EPG); and

indicating an availability of an interactive function in a program corresponding to the EPG simultaneously at said plurality of hand-held devices.

10. The method of claim 9, wherein the indicating includes displaying an indicator on a display of the apparatus.

11. The method of claim 10, wherein the indicating includes changing the background colors of the display to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.

12. The method of claim 10, wherein the indicating includes the display flashing to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.

13. The method of claim 9, wherein the apparatus is a personal digital assistant.

14. The method of claim 9, wherein the apparatus is a web phone.

15. The method of claim 9, wherein the indicating includes generating a sound to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.

16. The method of claim 9, wherein the indicating includes illuminating a section of the apparatus to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.

18. A machine readable medium having stored thereon a set of instructions, which when executed cause a system to perform a method comprising:

transmitting information and receiving information via a wireless connection simultaneously to and from a plurality of hand-held devices, the information interacting with an electronic programming guide (EPG); and

indicating an availability of an interactive function in a program corresponding to the EPG simultaneously at said plurality of hand-held devices.

19. The machine readable medium of claim 17, wherein the indicating includes displaying an indicator on a display of the apparatus.

20. The machine readable medium of claim 18, wherein the indicating includes changing the background colors of the display to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.

21. The machine readable medium of claim 18, wherein the indicating includes the display flashing to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.

22. The machine readable medium of claim 17, wherein the apparatus is a personal digital assistant.

The machine readable medium of claim 17, wherein the apparatus is a web phone.

23. The machine readable medium of claim 17, wherein the indicating includes a unit of the apparatus generating a sound to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.
24. The machine readable medium of claim 17, wherein the indicating includes a section of the apparatus illuminating to indicate the availability of the interactive function in the program corresponding to the EPG.

Applicant : Kikinis
Serial No. : 09/875,707
Filed : June 5, 2001
Page : 19 of 20

Attorney's Docket No.: ISURFTV137

Evidence Appendix

None.

Applicant : Kikinis
Serial No. : 09/875,707
Filed : June 5, 2001
Page : 20 of 20

Attorney's Docket No.: ISURFTV137

Related Proceedings Appendix

None.

3884757_v1